

Beauties of the Truth

A Forum for the Publication of Scriptural Viewpoints
Thought to be Harmonious with God's Plan of the Ages
Volume 2, Number 8, August 1981

Spoil
Burnt
Cross or Torture Stake?
Chronology of Growth in Papal Power

Spoil

A study on the word "spoil" as used in Matthew 12:29.

In this verse, our Lord gives us considerable information in regard to the sequence of events, here at the end of the Age. Being so brief, it is necessary that we carefully consider the meaning of each word, in order to get the correct meaning. In this verse, the word "spoil" needs careful attention, since its meaning is often misunderstood. Unfortunately Bro. Russell, in some cases, uses the word in a sense somewhat different from the Scriptural usage.

Matthew 12:29: "Or else how can one enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house."

Strong's Concordance: Spoil, Diarpazo: to seize asunder; plunder.
Young's Concordance: Spoil: to snatch away thoroughly.

In checking other translations, we found none that used the word "spoil," but instead such words as ransack, plunder, loot and steal. We will quote two:

Weymouth: "Again, how can anyone enter the house of a strong man and carry off his goods, unless first of all he masters and secures the strong man? Then will he ransack his house."
Interlinear Greek-English N.T.: "Or how can anyone to enter into the house of the strong man and the vessels of his to seize, if not first he binds the strong man and then the house of him he will plunder."

The word "spoil" appears about 118 times in the Bible. In 14 cases in the Old Testament it is translated from a Hebrew word meaning to injure or destroy. In the other places, it is translated from an original word meaning to take after a victory. That evidently is the meaning in Matthew 12:29.

A69 top: "Thus we are taught that Satan must first be bound, restrained and deposed before Christ's reign of peace and righteousness can be established."

R575 p I: "The strong prince of this world has obtained much spoil from mankind, leaving him destitute; but this great Deliverer shall not only bind the strong man, but then shall he spoil his house (Matthew 12:29), and during his reign he shall divide or distribute the spoil to mankind, until at its close they shall be very rich in glory, honor and dominion of earth as at first."

These two quotations relate to our topic. The first gives a general picture. The second uses the word "spoil" exactly as it is used in the Scripture. Satan has been the god of this world, but our Lord is going to complete his binding, and then take over. The binding of Satan, which includes the breaking down or destroying of the present systems, will be completed by the time, or before, the Mediatorial, reign begins, then the spoiling, or taking over, can proceed.

The word "spoil" does not mean destroy; but in the reality the "spoiling" will follow closely after the destruction of this order of things and thus could be said to be closely associated. We are told in Vine's Commentary that in some Greek texts the word translated "spoil" in the first instance in Matthew 12:29 is *harpazo*. The meaning of this word is essentially the same as *diarpazo*, though less intensive.

Two other words in this Scripture might be mentioned: "house" and "goods." These seem to be good translations of the original, and need no elaboration. From the way these are used, we get the thought that although the Lord returned in 1874 and entered the strong man's house, he did not immediately exercise dominion, or take full control of earth and the affairs on earth among mankind. He will first bind Satan by breaking down his influence, and then destroying the evil systems which were established under Satan's influence. Then "the still small voice" will speak peace. Conditions on earth now indicate that Christ is not yet exercising full dominion, full control. When he does, nothing will be allowed to hurt nor destroy.

Burnt?

Some question has arisen concerning Leviticus 9:24. What offering is it which was here consumed? Some have felt it to be (1) the daily evening offering; others feel it to be (2) the remains of the sacrifices earlier in Leviticus 9; yet others have thought it to be (3) one of the animals of verse 2. The answer seems to be hidden in the three Hebrew words translated "burnt" (among other translations). A full comprehension of these words will necessitate a complete investigation of these words in their various uses. This article will supply only the suggested conclusions of such a study.

Strong's #6999 seems to mean in its usage "turning to fragrance by fire." Hence it is usually translated "burn incense." However, in chapters dealing with the tabernacle, it is not translated in that manner. The implication, however, is that its use in tabernacle chapters has something to do with a sacrifice done in order to create an acceptable "fragrance" before the Lord. (See Exodus

30:7; 1 Kings 9:25, 2 Chronicles 26:16, Jeremiah 11:13, Leviticus 9:10, 13, 14, 17, 20, 8:16, 20, 21, 28, 16:25 for examples.)

Strong's #8313 seems always to imply total destruction by fire or at least a thorough burning. (See Deuteronomy 12:3, Exodus 12:10, 29:34, 2 Chronicles 36:19, Leviticus 8:17, 32, 9:11, 16:28 for examples.)

Strong's #5930 seems to mean "ascending" in the sense of smoke climbing in the air. This word is usually translated burnt offerings. (See Genesis 22:2, Leviticus 8:18, 9:2, 16:3 for examples.) This word does not seem to be used to imply a complete consuming, but rather seems to be used as a term to describe the offering. Hence, burnt offerings (offerings which have the main function of sending up smoke) are used to picture that the other offerings had ascended to God (ie., they had proven acceptable).

All three of these words are usually translated into phrases instead of merely into single words. This, and their usage, can most easily be seen in The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament. (Numerically coded to Strong's.)

Having summarized the usage of these words, their application in Leviticus 9 can better be seen. Strong's #8313 is used only in verse 11. This seems to imply the purpose of totally consuming these parts as being useless.

Strong's #5930 is always translated "burnt offering" (or "burnt sacrifice") in this chapter. It is found in verses 2, 3, 7, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 22 and 24. The term seems to be used descriptively as above explained.

Strong's #6999 is a key word. It is used in verses 10, 13, 14, 17 and 20. It is important to remember its difference from #8313 as found in verse 11. #6999 does not seem to mean to destroy by fire. In each of the verses in which it is found it seems to imply burning NOT for the purpose of destruction, but for the purpose of a sweet savor ascending to God. The Socino translation (a Hebrew Rabbinical translation and commentary) translates this word in each of these verses with the phrase "made it smoke."

CONCLUSION: It seems, due to these words, that the various sacrifices of the day were not totally consumed when burnt (as #8313 would seem to have meant if it had been used). (This may be suggested in verse 17. Is this verse suggesting that the morning offering yet remained in part?) If the sacrifices remained in part, the 24th verse is explained. The miraculous "consuming" (Strong's #398, to eat) devoured the remains of not only the burnt offering (possibly the evening sacrifice, seeing that the morning sacrifice is mentioned in verse 17), but also the fat. The mention of fat in addition to a burnt offering suggests the remains of more than one offering.

The antitype, of course, is lovely. The total end of all sacrifice will be heralded by the manifestation of the sons of God (Romans 8:19). This is surely when the people will shout and fall on their faces.

- *Contributed*

Cross or Torture Stake?

Many have been plagued by the fruitless arguments of a well-known organization whose adherents make much of the question of what it was upon which Jesus was crucified (or "impaled"). One brother was accosted with the question at a fair booth: "Why do you have Jesus hanging on a pagan symbol?" His answer as classic: "Because it was pagans who killed him." Perhaps the matter is not worth the space for consideration. Yet, if any feel it is, there is both historical Scriptural support that Jesus was slain on a two-piece cross.

Strong's Concordance (as other lexicons) demonstrates that the Greek word is of no help in solving the question.

Archaeological findings of the period (see McClintock and Strong, Vol. 2, pp. 575-581) are strongly in favor of two piece crosses. One-piece crosses, when used, either had the victims tied to them, or the stake was run through the body. The descriptions of Jesus' death obviously do not meet these conditions. The term "impale" (used in a modern translation) is most unfortunate, as the term suggests running the pole through the person's body, not affixing the person to the stake. The Scriptural evidence, as usual, is the strongest available evidence. It is clear from John 20:25 that nails (plural) were used in Jesus' hands. (Also note prophetic references to plural nails, Psalm 22:16, and to piercing of hands and feet, Zechariah 12:10.) On a single upright the hands would have to be above the head and almost certainly upon each other fastened with a single nail. On a crosspiece, of course, plural nails are a necessity. Another evidence, a strong one, is suggested in Matthew 27:37 and John 19:19, 20.

A sign, large enough to be written clearly in three languages, was placed OVER HIS HEAD. Had Jesus been hanging with his arms over his head on a single-piece stake, the sign could not have been over his head, but over his hands. This problem disappears with a two-piece cross.

- Contributed

Chronology of Papal Growth in Temporal Power

"Setting up of the abomination that maketh desolate" 4th-5th centuries. The church's role in a collapsing Empire. "The Papacy was concerned with holding the Church together and protecting it from the invading barbarians. During the course of these invasions, both the popes and the bishops in the Roman Empire found themselves acquiring property and power by default as the Roman administration collapsed. This fusion of ecclesiastical and political functions in the bishops' hands led to serious problems in the Middle Ages ... By the 5th century the pope was the largest landowner in Italy." (Collier's Encyclopedia, 1975 edition, "Papacy," Vol. 18, p. 400) 445 AD. The Roman bishop gains prestige. "[In] 445 AD [the Emperor] Valentinian III issued a law by which the Roman bishop was declared the supreme head of the Western Church. This law gave for its reasons-the primacy of Peter, the dignity of the city [of Rome], and the decree of a holy synod. Resistance to the authority of the Roman bishop was affirmed to be an offence against the Roman state." (History, of the Christian Church, George P. Fisher, p. 107) 476 AD. Fall of the Western Empire. (1st horn of Daniel 7:8) "When and how did Rome fall? The first term in the title

of Gibbon's famous work was more appropriate than the second. After the division of the empire and the removal of the seat of its western part from the city of Rome, there was a long decline - an evaporation of authority, a sinking of its vitality, the gradual fading and ultimate disappearance of its apparatus of government. Though moribund, it still drew a labored breath after the raid on Rome by Alaric the Goth (410). The invasion of Italy by Attila the Hun (451) left the Western empire virtually unconscious. It died in a coma a few years later, though already it had practically ceased to exist. When the insignificant Romulus Augustulus was deposed (476), there was no longer even a titular emperor. The ghost of the Western empire-feeble even for a ghost-was the shadowy claim of the Eastern emperor at Constantinople to the allegiance of the barbarian chiefs who exercised independent military control in Italy, Gaul, Spain, and North Africa. The only part of that claim that ever had any historical reality was the Eastern emperor's exarchate at Ravenna." (20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History, Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, p. 93) [A conglomeration of barbaric Germanic tribes, including the Heruli, Sciri, Rugii, and others, which once had acknowledged the rule of Attila, swept down into Italy.] "By 476 AD, [Odoacer or Odoacer] had evidently distinguished himself sufficiently to be readily chosen as their king." [The new invaders demanded a third of Italy; when I refused, they at once slew Orestes, the Roman general, and deposed his son Romulus Augustulus as emperor.] "It is indeed a new and important fact, that after 476 AD there was no Western Emperor until the year 800 [at the coronation of Charlemagne], and it must be admitted that the absence of any separate Emperor of the West vitally affected both the history of the Teutonic tribes and the development of the Papacy, during those three centuries." (The Cambridge Medieval History, edited by H. M. Gwatkin and J. P. Whitney, "Italy and the West, 410-476 AD," by Ernest Barker in Volume 111, pp. 430-431.)

"[Pope Simplicius'] pontificate [468-483 AD] saw the disappearance of the Western Roman empire. The boy emperor Romulus Augustulus was deposed in 476 [by Odoacer]; no successor to him was nominated and when the barbarian patrician Odoacer [the title of 'patrician' was given by the Byzantine emperor], the real master of Italy, sent the imperial insignia to Constantinople, the Eastern emperor seemed to have become the sole rightful sovereign of the Roman world. This elimination of the imperial power in the West served perforce to enhance the prestige of the papacy throughout that half of the world, where it had begun to emerge as the focus of authority ever since Constantine had left Rome for Constantinople." (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1972 edition, "Papacy," Vol. 17, p. 243)

493 AD. The Ostrogoth king defeats Odoacer. (2nd horn of Daniel 7:8) "[Emperor] Zeno ... pleased that Theodoric should go into Italy ... sent him to attack Odoacer ... In 488 AD Theodoric crossed the frontier at the head of his Goths; it was the first step in the conquest which took five years to complete ... The conquest of Italy was practically achieved between 490 and 493; ... with the capitulation of Odoacer, which took place at this latter date, the victory of Theodoric was complete." (The Cambridge Medieval History, "The Kingdom of Italy under Odoacer and Theodoric," by Maurice Dumoulin, Volume 111, pp. 438-439)

"In 489 ... [the Byzantine Emperor] Zeno sent another barbarian against [Odoacer], Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths. Theodoric defeated Odoacer (493 AD), established himself in Italy, and lived for several periods in Rome. (Encic. Brit., 1972, "Rome," Vol. 19, p. 582)

533 AD Roman bishop acknowledged as head of all the churches. "Pope John II, a Roman by birth succeeded Boniface II in the Roman see in 532 AD The Emperor Justinian, in a letter addressed to him shortly after his accession [533], after earnest assurances of his endeavor to unite the Western and Eastern churches, makes full confession of superior power belonging to the Roman hierarchy, designating him as "the head of the holy Church.'" (Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature, John McClintock and James Strong, "Pope John II," Vol. IV, p. 978) 534 AD. Emperor sends army to defeat Ostrogoths.

"Amalasantha, daughter of Theodoric ... [proposed] to [Emperor] Justinian the conquest of Italy (534 AD) . . ." [The Ostrogoths, who were Arians and did not recognize the Roman bishop as the supreme pontiff, were then in control of Rome and the capital city of Italy, Ravenna. Accordingly, the emperor dispatched General Belisarius with an army to vanquish the Ostrogoths.] "[In] 535 AD, ... Belisarius landed in Sicily and occupied it, hardly needing to strike a blow ... Greeted by the Italian people as a liberator, [he] in turn seized Naples and occupied Rome unopposed (536 AD) . . ." (The Cambridge Medieval History, "Justinian. The Imperial Restoration in the West," by Charles Diehl, Vol. II, pp. 14-15) 539 AD. Ostrogoth kingdom (3rd horn of Daniel 7:8 defeated at Faveima. "The imperialists [under Belisarius] beseiged it [Ravenna, the capital of Italy] [at the] end of 539 AD. for six months the Ostrogoths held out [before capitulating in 540]." (But see Gibbons note, 2nd paragraph following.) (The Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. 11, pp. 15-16) "Justinian sent an army to destroy the Gothic monarchy and restore Italy to the empire. The Goths at length ... offered to transfer their allegiance to [General] Belisarius on condition of his assuming the diadem of the Western Empire. Belisarius dallied with the proposal until he had obtained an entrance within the walls of the capital and proclaimed his inviolable fidelity to Justinian (539 AD)." (Ency. Brit., 1962, "Ravenna," Vol. 18, p. 999)

"The day of the surrender of Ravenna was stipulated by the Gothic ambassadors: ... the gates were opened to the fancied king of Italy; and Belisarius, without meeting an enemy, triumphantly marched through the streets of an impregnable city." [A footnote here states: "Ravenna was taken, not in the year 540, but in the latter end of 539; and Pagi (tom. ii. p. 569) is rectified by Muratori, (Annali d'Italia, tom. v. p. 62) who proves from an original act on papyrus (Antiquit. Italiae Medii Aevi, tom. ii. dissert. xxxii. p. 999-1007) Maffei, (Istoria Diplomat. p. 155-160) that before the third of January, 540, peace and free correspondence were restored between Cavenna and Faenza."] (The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Edward Gibbon, Vol. IV, p. 180) 554 AD. Pope's temporal authority confirmed. (Rise of the "little horn" of Daniel 7:8) [During the reign of Pope Vigilius (537-555 AD), Emperor Justinian issued a "pragmatic sanction" of the papacy:] "By this act, the emperor acknowledged, confirmed and increased the temporal power of the pope, who was henceforth to have a voice in the nomination of the governors of the Italian provinces of the empire and to participate in the control of their finances. The pope became the official protector of the civil population against the depredations of the military, against extortion by the tax collectors, and against abuse of power by the administration." (Ency. Brit., 1972, "Papacy," Vol. 17, p. 244)

556 AD. Pope's temporal authority enforced. "[Pelagius I succeeded Vigilius as pope, and he] made resolute use of the pope's new rights, organizing the temporal government of the territory over which he was actually sovereign and setting the papacy on the road to real political power. This power was to grow so rapidly that Gregory the Great [590-604 AD] could write, a few years

later: 'I should like to know whether the pope, in this world, is a spiritual leader or a temporal king.' (Ency. Brit., 1972, "Papacy," Vol. 17, p. 244)

Summary. "After the downfall of the Western Roman empire the political influence of the popes in Italy became of still more importance, from the fact that the popes had to take under their protection the unfortunate country, but particularly Rome and its environs, which were so often changing masters and continually exposed to the invasions of coarse and brutal conquerors. While the successors of St. Peter were so energetically interesting themselves in the welfare of the inhabitants of Italy, the latter were totally neglected by the Eastern Roman emperors who still laid claim to rule the land. Even after Justinian I had reconquered a part of Italy [AD 539] and converted it into a Grecian province, the lot of the inhabitants was no better; for the Byzantine emperors could only exhaust by taxation 'the subjects of the Exarchate of Ravenna, but in no way could they afford her the necessary protection.

Under these circumstances it happened that the ... emperors ... lost all actual power, and remained only in name masters of the government, while the popes, in virtue of the needs of the moment, came practically in possession of that supremacy over the Roman domain ... This spontaneous result of generous exertion was in after times acknowledged as a lawful acquisition [by Pepin and Charlemagne] ... In this legitimate way, the temporal power and sovereignty of the popes was ... gradually established." (The History of the Catholic Church, H. Brueck, Vol. 1, pp. 250-251)

- *Contributed*

We urge that the presentations of this journal be tried thoughtfully by all readers. "Prove all things, hold fast to that which is good" We do not necessarily endorse every expression of contributed articles appearing herein. Information on the authorship of any article is freely supplied on request. Address all correspondence to: Beauties of the Truth, 9159 Via de Amor, Santee, CA 92071. Published through Millennial Morning.